

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 4-6, 12-14, 20-22, 29-31, and 58 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 7-11, 15-19, 23-28, 32-57 and 59 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-11, 15-19, 23-28, 32-57 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,664) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 7,188,151) and further in view of Stanger (U.S. Patent No. 7,376,159). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 26, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., page 17 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

multiplexing the stream of first data packets with the second data packets by inserting a respective plurality of second data packets, which corresponds to one of the predetermined time intervals, into one of the empty regions of the stream that is adjacent to a respective plurality of first data packets which corresponds to a same one of the predetermined time intervals[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of the relied on sections of Fernandez, the relied on sections of Kumar, nor the relied on sections of Stanger disclose or suggest inserting a respective plurality of second data packets, which corresponds to a predetermined time interval, into an empty regions of a stream that

is adjacent to a respective plurality of first data packets which corresponds to a same predetermined time interval.

Rather, such sections of Stanger simply describe substituting auxiliary data for null data in a compressed data stream. (See col.2 ll.25-27 and col.7 ll.49-52.) These sections are not concerned with substituting auxiliary data which corresponds to a predetermined time interval for null data that is adjacent to data which corresponds to a same predetermined time interval.

As the Office Action acknowledges, neither the relied on sections of the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar overcome the deficiencies of the relied on sections of Stanger.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Fernandez, the relied on sections of Kumar, nor the relied on sections of Stanger, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the information transmission method set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 9, 17, 26, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 1. Therefore, each of these claims is patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Fernandez, Kumar, and Stanger at least for the same reasons.

Claims 2-3 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, claims 10-11 and 15-16 depend from claim 9, claims 18-19 and 23-25 depend from claim 17, claims 27-28 and 32-34 depend from claim 26, claims 36-39 depend from claim 35, claims 41-44 depend from claim 40, claims 46-49 depend from claim 45, claims 51-54 depend from

claim 50, and claims 56-57 and 59 depend from claim 55. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Lawrence  
E. Russ/  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

1195249\_1.DOC